Let me give you an example of some of the steps that the tobacco companies may be pursuing in the days ahead to circumvent efforts by the Federal Government such as those we discussed last week.

We know the tobacco companies are now test marketing cigarettes which produce less smoke so that individuals around the smoker will not be bothered in the same way as they were so often in the past. Yet, one of the cigarettes, the Eclipse, made by RJR, is showing even more signs of being dangerous to the smoker. With the Eclipse, the evidence shows that smokers may actually be breathing in glass fibers in addition to other carcinogens.

I think it is important that the Senate understand this as we go forward with further discussions about how the tobacco settlement funds are going to be used. If the Federal Government wishes to waive its portion of the billions of dollars involved in the tobacco settlement, let's make sure that at least a portion of this money—at least a modest portion—is used to protect future generations of Americans against the tobacco industry.

I hope the Congress won't pass up another opportunity to protect America's youngsters. I urge my colleagues to continue to try to assure that some portion of the dollars secured in the tobacco settlement are actually used for health services for American's children.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a chart prepared by the National Center for Tobacco-Free Kids which compares the compensation package of just two of the tobacco CEOs with the money that would have been received by the States under the Senate legislation be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPARISON OF AMOUNT STATES WOULD HAVE BEEN REQUIRED TO SPEND ON TOBACCO PREVENTION UNDER THE SPECTER-HARKIN AMENDMENT WITH CEOS' COMPENSATION FROM RJR AND PHILIP MORRIS

States	15% of tobacco settlement payments (millions per year)	20% of tobacco settlement payments (millions per year)	Combined total CEO's compensation for 1998 (millions)
Wyoming	$2.71	$3.61	$36
Alaska	3.72	4.96	36
South Dakota	3.80	5.07	36
Idaho	3.96	5.27	36
North Dakota	3.98	5.31	36
Delaware	4.31	5.74	36
Vermont	4.48	5.97	36
Montana	4.62	6.16	36
Utah	4.84	6.46	36
Nebraska	6.48	8.64	36
New Mexico	6.49	8.65	36
Hawaii	6.55	8.73	36
Washington, DC	6.61	8.81	36
Nevada	6.64	8.85	36
New Hampshire	7.25	9.67	36
Rhode Island	7.82	10.43	36
Maine	8.37	11.16	36
Arkansas	9.01	12.01	36
Kansas	9.07	12.10	36
Iowa	9.47	12.62	36
West Virginia	9.65	12.87	36
Oklahoma	11.28	15.04	36
Oregon	12.49	16.65	36
South Carolina	12.81	17.07	36
Colorado	14.92	19.90	36
Arizona	16.04	21.39	36
Alabama	17.59	23.45	36
Kentucky	19.17	25.56	36
Connecticut	20.21	26.94	36
Indiana	22.20	29.60	36
Virginia	22.26	29.67	36
Washington	22.35	29.80	36
Wisconsin	22.56	30.07	36
Louisiana	24.55	32.73	36
Maryland	24.61	32.81	36
Missouri	24.76	33.01	36
Mississippi	25.20	33.60	36
North Carolina	25.38	33.84	36
Tennessee	26.57	35.42	36
Georgia	26.72	35.62	36
Minnesota	37.02	49.36	36
New Jersey	42.09	56.12	36
Massachusetts	43.96	58.61	36
Michigan	47.37	63.16	36
Illinois	50.66	67.55	36
Ohio	54.83	73.10	36
Pennsylvania	62.55	83.40	36
Florida	80.40	107.20	36
Texas	94.20	125.60	36
New York	138.91	185.21	36
California	138.93	185.24	36

In 39 states and the District of Columbia the use 20% of their total settlement dollars is less than the combined compensation of the top two Tobacco industry CEOs Geoffrey Bible, of Philip Morris Inc. and Stephen F. Goldstone, of RJ Reynolds Tobacco. The compensation total includes base salary plus bonuses and stock options (source: USA Today, 3/19/99 & 3/16/99).

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, the time between 1 p.m. and 2 p.m. shall be under the control of the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, or his designee.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I might use. If others arrive on the floor and I have exceeded my 10 or 12 minutes, I will yield to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this week we will have the budget for the Nation before the Senate for consideration. I want to speak now on that budget, and give special focus and attention to the concerns I have about how that budget was put together and its particular implications with regard to Social Security and to Medicare, and also with regard to other domestic priorities. Then I will express my concern on the priority that the Republican budget has given to tax cuts and how that relates to the Nation's priorities and to the Nation's needs.

Mr. President, the Republican FY2000 budget resolution fails to meet the nation's priorities.

It claims that it will extend the solvency of the Social Security Trust Fund. In reality, it would prevent President Clinton's proposed transfer of surplus funds to protect this important program for future generations.

The Republican budget claims that it will set aside money for Medicare. In reality, it squanders those funds to pay for a tax cut for the rich.

The Republican budget claims that it will improve education. In reality, it slashes funds for critical programs like Head Start, job training, and student aid to pay for increases in education.

On the subject of Social Security, the Republican budget is an exercise in deception. The rhetoric surrounding the budget itself conveys the impression that the majority have taken a major step towards protecting Social Security. In truth, they have done nothing to strengthen Social Security. Their budget would not provide one additional dollar to pay benefits to future retirees, nor would it extend the life of the trust fund by even one day. It merely recommits to Social Security those dollars which already belong to the Trust Fund under current law. That is all their so-called ''lockbox'' does.

By contrast, President Clinton's proposed budget would contribute 2.8 trillion new dollars of the budget surplus to Social Security over the next 15 years. By doing so, his budget would extend the life of the trust fund by more than a generation—to beyond 2050.

Not only does the Republican plan fail to provide the new revenue to extend the life of the Social Security trust fund, it does not even effectively guarantee that the existing payroll tax revenue will be used to pay Social Security benefits. In essence, there is a trapdoor in the Republican lockbox. Their plan would allow Social Security payroll taxes to be used to finance unspecified ''reforms''. This loophole opens the door to schemes to privatize Social Security by turning it over to the tender mercy of the private insurance industry. Such a privatization plan could actually make Social Security's financial picture far worse than it is today, necessitating deep benefit cuts.

A genuine ''lockbox'' would prevent any such diversion of funds. A genuine ''lockbox'' would guarantee that those payroll tax dollars would be used to protect Social Security, not undermine it.

While the Republicans claim that they, too, support using the surplus for debt reduction, they are still unwilling to use it in a way that will help save Social Security for future generations. There is a fundamental difference between the parties on how the savings which will result from debt reduction should be used. The Federal Government will realize enormous savings from paying down the debt. As a result, billions of dollars which would have been required to pay interest on the national debt will become available each year for other purposes. President Clinton believes those debt savings should be used to strengthen Social Security. I wholeheartedly agree. But the Republicans refuse to commit those dollars to Social Security. Their budget does nothing to increase Social Security's ability to pay full benefits to future generations of retirees. Again, they are short-changing Social Security while pretending to save it.

Currently, the Federal Government spends more than 11 cents of every budget dollar to pay the cost of interest on the national debt. By using the Social Security surplus to pay down the debt over the next 15 years, we can reduce the debt service cost to just 2 cents of every budget dollar by the year 2014 and to zero by 2018. Such prudent fiscal management now will produce an enormous savings to the Government in future years. Since it is payroll tax revenues which made the debt reduction possible, those savings should, in turn, be used to strengthen Social Security when it needs additional revenue to finance the baby boomers' retirement.

Rather than paying interest to bondholding investors today, our plan would use that money to finance Social Security benefits tomorrow. This is analogous to the situation of a couple with young children and a mortgage. They know they will have a major expense 15 years down the road when their children reach college age. They use their extra money now to pay down their home mortgage ahead of schedule. As a result, in 15 years the mortgage will be greatly reduced or even paid off. Thus, the dollars that were going to pay the mortgage each month will be available to finance college for their children. In the same way the Federal Government is reducing its debt over the next 15 years so that it can apply the savings to Social Security in the future.

That is what the President's budget proposes. It would provide an additional $2.8 trillion to Social Security, most of it in debt service savings, between 2030 and 2055. As a result, the current level of Social Security benefits would be fully financed for all future recipients for more than half a century. It is an eminently reasonable plan, but Republican Members of Congress oppose it.

The budget Republicans have brought to the floor does not provide one new dollar to finance Social Security benefits. What it does provide is nearly 800 billion new dollars for tax cuts over the next decade. Tax cuts, not strengthening Social Security, is their first priority. Budgets speak louder than words. The actual Republican budget tells us much more candidly than their rhetoric about the GOP's goal of tax cuts at the expense of Social Security.

Mr. President, in addition to claims of extending the solvency of the Social Security trust fund, this budget would prevent the President's proposed transfer of surplus funds to protect important programs for future generations. The Republican budget claims that it will set aside money for Medicare, but in reality it squanders those funds to pay for a tax cut. This is unacceptable. Even worse is the Republican attempt to privatize Medicare—or use the crisis in Medicare financing that their budget will create as an excuse to promote their extreme agenda of slashing Medicare benefits and turning over the program to private insurance companies.

This is the same agenda that Republicans pursued unsuccessfully in 1995 and 1996, and it was the agenda rejected by President Clinton and Democrats in Congress and the American people. But now our Republican friends are at it again.

According to the most recent projections of the Medicare Trustees, if we do nothing else, keeping Medicare solvent for the next 25 years will require benefit cuts of almost 20 percent—massive cuts of hundreds of billions of dollars. The President's plan makes up that shortfall, without any benefit cuts, by investing 15 percent of the surplus in the Trust Fund. This investment avoids the need for any benefit cuts for at least the next 21 years. It also gives us time to develop policies that can reduce Medicare costs without also reducing the health care that the elderly need and deserve.

But Republicans in Congress have a different agenda. They want to use the surplus to grant undeserved tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans—and then use the Medicare shortfall as an excuse to slash the program and turn it over to private insurance companies.

Republicans on the Budget Committee had a clear opportunity to preserve, protect and improve Medicare. All they had to do was to adopt the President's proposal for investing 15% of the surplus in Medicare. Instead of protecting Medicare, they use the surplus to pay for billions of dollars in new tax breaks for the wealthy. You don't need a degree in higher mathematics to understand what is going on here.

Because the Republican budget does nothing to preserve and protect Medicare, their proposals add up to billions of dollars in Medicare cuts.

Every senior citizen knows—and their children and grandchildren know, too—that the elderly cannot afford cuts in Medicare. They are already stretched to the limit—and sometimes beyond the limit—to purchase the health care they need today. Because of gaps in Medicare and high health care costs, Medicare now covers only about 50% of the health care costs of senior citizens. On average, senior citizens spend 19% of their limited incomes to purchase the health care they need—almost as large a proportion as they had to pay before Medicare was enacted a generation ago. Many senior citizens have to pay even more as a proportion of their income. By 2025, if we do nothing, that proportion will have risen to 29%. Too often, even with today's Medicare benefits, the elderly have to choose between putting food on the table, paying the rent, or purchasing the health care they need.

The typical Medicare beneficiary is a single woman, seventy-six years old, living alone, with an annual income of approximately $10,000. She has one or more chronic illnesses. She is a mother and a grandmother. These are the women whose benefits Republicans want to cut to pay for new tax breaks for the wealthy. These are the women who will be unable to see a doctor, or will go without needed prescription drugs, or who will go without meals or heat, so that wealthy Americans earning hundreds of thousands of dollars a year can have additional thousands of dollars a year in tax breaks.

This is the wrong priority—and Americans know it is the wrong priority, even if Republicans in Congress do not.

We all recall that four years ago, Republicans in Congress also tried to cut Medicare to pay for new tax breaks for the wealthy. They sought to cut Medicare by $270 billion to pay for $240 billion worth of tax cuts for the wealthiest individuals and corporations. Under their proposals, senior citizens would have seen their premiums skyrocket—an additional $2,400 for senior couples over the budget period. The deductible that senior citizens pay to see a physician would have doubled. The Medicare eligibility age would have been raised to 67. Protections against extra billing by doctors would have been rolled back. Under the guise of preserving Medicare, Republicans also proposed to turn the program over to private insurance companies, and force senior citizens to give up their family doctors and join HMOs. But President Clinton and Democrats in Congress stood firm against these regressive proposals, and they were not enacted into law.

Now, Republicans on the Finance Committee and House Ways and Means Committee are at it again. They are already drafting new Medicare ''reform'' plans. No details have been revealed. But the funds already earmarked for tax breaks for the wealthy under the Republican budget proposal means that there is no alternative to the harsh cuts in Medicare. No wonder so many senior citizens believe that G.O.P. stands for ''Get Old People.'' The Republican elephant never learns.

As we debate these issues this week, the Republican response is predictable. They will deny that they have any plans to cut Medicare. But the American people will not be fooled. They know that the President's plan will put Medicare on a sound financial footing for the next two decades—without benefit cuts, without tax increases, and without raising the retirement age. They also know that the Republican plan will take the surplus intended for Medicare and squander it on new tax breaks for the wealthy. They know that the Republican plan for Medicare is benefit cuts and additional burdens on the elderly, not the honest protection our senior citizens deserve.

This week, Democrats will offer amendments to assure that this year's budget protects Medicare, rather than destroying it. Under our proposals, all of the funds the President has proposed to devote to Medicare will be put into the Medicare Trust Fund. Our amendments will assure that Medicare will be solvent for the next 21 years, without benefit cuts or tax increases or raising the retirement age. Republicans will have a chance to vote on whether they are sincere about protecting Medicare—and the vote on our amendments will test whether they care more about senior citizens or the wealthy.

The choice is clear. The Congress must act to preserve the benefits that senior citizens have earned, instead of granting new tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans.

Just as important as preserving and protecting Medicare is improving it. And the most important single step we can take to improve Medicare is to provide prescription drug coverage for senior citizens. Medicare is a compact between workers and their government that says, ''Work hard, pay into the system when you are young, and Medicare will provide health security in your retirement years.'' But that commitment is being broken every day, because Medicare does not cover prescription drugs.

When Medicare was enacted in 1964, coverage of prescription drugs by private insurance was not the norm—and Medicare followed the standard practice in the private insurance market. Today, ninety-nine percent of employment-based health insurance policies provide prescription drug coverage—but Medicare does not. Medicare is caught in a 35 year old time warp—and too many senior citizens are suffering as a result.

Too many seniors take half the pills their doctor prescribes, or don't fill needed prescriptions—because they simply cannot afford the high cost of prescription drugs. In 1983, before the most recent surge in drug costs, one in eight senior citizens said they sometimes had to choose between prescription drugs and food on the table. Too many elderly Americans are paying twice as much as they should for the drugs they need, because they are forced to pay the full price, while other Americans pay less because their health plans grant discounts.

As a result, too many senior citizens are ending up hospitalized—at immense cost to Medicare—because they are not receiving the drugs they need or are not taking them correctly. As we enter the new century, pharmaceutical products are increasingly the source of miracle cures for more and more diseases—but senior citizens will be left out and left behind if we do not act.

The 21st century may well be the century of life sciences. With the support of the American people, Congress is on its way to the goal of doubling the budget of the National Institutes of Health to support additional basic research, so that scientists can develop new therapies to improve and extend the lives of senior citizens and all citizens.

These miracle drugs save lives—and they save dollars too, by preventing unnecessary hospitalization and expensive surgery. All patients deserve affordable access to these medications. Yet, Medicare, the nation's largest insurer, does not cover out-patient prescription drugs, and senior citizens and persons with disabilities pay a heavy price for this glaring omission.

Up to 19 million Medicare beneficiaries are forced to fend for themselves when it comes to purchasing these life-saving and life-improving therapies. They have no prescription drug coverage from any source. Other Medicare beneficiaries have some coverage, but too often it is inadequate, unreliable and unaffordable.

Prescription drugs are the single largest out-of-pocket cost to the elderly for health services. The average senior citizen fills an average of eighteen prescriptions a year, and takes four to six prescriptions daily. Many elderly Americans face monthly drug bills of $100 to $200 or more. Some of the newer drugs that can produce miraculous results for those who can afford them cost $10,000 a year or more.

Misuse of prescription drugs results in preventable illnesses that cost Medicare an estimated $16–$20 billion annually, while imposing vast misery on senior citizens. What are needed are effective ways to encourage proper use. Large savings to Medicare will result if physicians, pharmacists and senior citizens are better educated about identifying, correcting, and preventing these problems.

Too often, elderly Americans skimp on their medicine—they take half doses or otherwise try to stretch their prescription and to make it last longer. This is not right. And it doesn't have to happen. If the prescription drugs they need are covered by Medicare, needless hospitalizations will be avoided and physician visits will be reduced.

The Senate Budget Committee recognized the need for prescription drug coverage by adopting a reserve fund for this coverage. But the Committee reserve fund is hedged with unacceptable conditions that could retard rather than enhance the cause of ensuring a meaningful drug benefit. The Congress can do better—and it must.

The provision in the budget resolution does not actually provide funds for a prescription drug benefit. Instead, it allows a prescription drug benefit to be enacted if certain conditions are met, but those conditions are far too limited.

Senior citizens need a drug benefit more than the wealthy need new tax breaks. Every senior citizen understands that—and so do their children and grandchildren.

Finally, it is vital that we continue to make investments in education programs that serve Americans of all ages. The Republican budget claims it will improve education. In reality, it slashes funds for critical programs like Head Start, job training, and student aid to pay for increases in education. It is vital that we continue to make investments in education programs which serve Americans of all ages. The Nation's children and families deserve the opportunity for a good education throughout their lives.

Student performance is rising across the nation by many indicators. The federal-state-local partnership is working—we shouldn't do anything to undermine it. Instead, we should do more to accelerate positive change.

Student achievement is improving. Performance on the National Assessment of Educational Progress has increased, particularly in reading, math, and science—critical subjects for success in learning. Average reading scores increased from 1994 to 1998 in 4th, 8th, and 12th grades. U.S. students scored near the top on the latest international assessment of reading, with 4th graders outperforming students from all other nations except Finland. Average performance in math has improved since 1978, with the largest gains made by 9-year-olds. Between 1992 and 1997, the combined verbal and math scores on the SAT increased by 15 points.

Students are taking more rigorous subjects than ever—and doing better in them. The proportion of high school graduates taking the core courses recommended in the 1983 report, A Nation At Risk, had increased to 52 percent by 1994, up from 14 percent in 1982 and 40 percent in 1990. Since 1982, the percentage of graduates taking biology, chemistry, and physics has doubled, rising from 10 percent in 1982 to 21 percent in 1994. With increased participation in advanced placement courses, the number of students who scored at the highest levels on AP exams has risen nearly five-fold since 1982, from 132,000 in 1982 to 636,000 in 1998.

But too many students in too many schools in too many communities across the country fail to achieve that standard. More children need to come to school ready to learn. More children need modern schools with world-class teachers. More students need opportunities for after-school programs. And more qualified students should be able to afford to go to college.

The Republican budget proposal is a welcome improvement over past years. Previous Republican plans drastically cut funding for education. In one of their first acts as the majority party in 1995, Republicans rescinded education funding by $1.7 billion and proposed to abolish the Department of Education. In subsequent years, they proposed to cut education by $3.9 billion and $3.1 billion. With the strong leadership of President Clinton, these cuts were never enacted, and Federal funding for education has steadily increased.

Republicans have finally begun to listen to the American people on education. The Senate Republican FY2000 Budget Resolution increases funding for elementary and secondary education by $2.6 billion over a freeze. But that increase in elementary and secondary education comes at an unacceptable and irresponsible cost. The Republicans proposed a reasonable increase in funding for elementary and secondary education, but at the same time they cut funding for critical programs like Head Start, job training, and aid for college students by at least 10 percent in FY2000 and by more than 20 percent in FY2004.

It is wrong to rob Peter to pay Paul, and it is wrong for the Republicans to propose this irresponsible budget.

It is irresponsible to increase funding for elementary and secondary education programs in order to improve the Nation's public schools and slash funding that helps young children and college students.

It is irresponsible to deny 100,000 children Head Start services that help them to come to school ready to learn.

It is irresponsible to eliminate 73,000 summer jobs and training opportunities for low-income young people.

It is irresponsible to jeopardize funding that helps make college more accessible and affordable for all qualified students.

It is irresponsible to ignore the needs of communities that need help in modernizing their school buildings. Schools across the nation face serious problems of overcrowding. Antiquated facilities are suffering from physical decay, and are not equipped to handle the needs of modern education. Across the country, 14 million children in a third of the nation's schools are learning in substandard buildings. Half the schools have at least one unsatisfactory environmental condition. It will take over $100 billion just to repair existing facilities nationwide.

It is irresponsible to do nothing to see that key education priorities will be met, such as reducing class size, improving teacher recruitment and training, expanding after-school programs, and ensuring strong accountability for how federal education dollars are spent.

Mr. President, a nation's budget is a reflection of its priorities. The nation's children and families deserve a budget that invests in their priorities—not the priorities of the right wing. Clearly, this Republican budget contains the wrong priorities for the nation's future. It gives priority to large tax cuts for the wealthy, instead of saving Social Security and Medicare, and at the expense of programs for college students, young children, and young adults. I urge my colleagues to oppose this misguided budget.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HOLLINGS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed in morning business for 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for 20 minutes following the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRUTH IN BUDGETING

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I remember the day when we had truth in budgeting. I will never forget when we promulgated in 1985, almost 15 years ago, the Gramm–Rudman-Hollings Act. At that time, we realized that Reaganomics was going up and away with respect to the growth of the debt and the accelerated interest costs upon that debt, not just necessarily the growth of the economy.

We got together on a bipartisan basis and, under the auspices of truth in budgeting, we came to the floor, and even though we had opposition on both sides early on—President Reagan opposed it, certainly over here the majority leader, the whip, and the chairman of the Budget Committee opposed it—on this side of the aisle, on 14 up-or-down votes, we got a majority of the Democrats on the basis of truth in budgeting.

Fifteen years later, we have gone to fraud in budgeting. It is all a political exercise that will bring us later in the year to what one might call a Mexican standoff. Then both sides will probably get together, hopefully, and, since the media will be covering them and they are moving into an election, do some saving of Social Security or at least some paying down of the debt. But I have a bill today, Mr. President, that actually requires us to save Social Security.

Let me mention that, once the government receives the moneys from the payroll tax under section 201 of the Social Security Act, it immediately buys special securities, 30-year T-bills. With those 30-year T-bills, of course, Social Security has the bond, or the IOU, the Government has the money, and obviously they have been spending that money for either increased spending or for tax cuts, but not for any paying down of the debt. The debt continues to go up.

Under section 201 in that particular instance, it is like having two credit cards. You have a Visa card and a MasterCard, and you want to pay off your MasterCard with your Visa card. So you pay down the public debt. Herein, let's say the Visa card is Social Security and the MasterCard is the public debt or Wall Street credit card. That is the crowd that does not want the sharp elbows of Government coming in and crowding out finance, running up interest costs and disturbing corporate finance.

When you take the Social Security credit card to pay down public debt, it is simply a transaction of increasing your Social Security debt. At the present time, the deficit in Social Security is some $730 billion in the red.

Mr. President, we did not intend that in 1983. In 1983, what we did was say: We are going to put in an inordinately high payroll tax in order to build up a surplus to take care of the baby boomers in the next generation.

That is exactly what we are not doing. We are crowding around on the floor saying, ''Beware, beware, beware, the baby boomers, baby boomers.'' It is not the baby boomers, it is the adults on the floor of the Senate looting the fund if we keep the money in, as was intended in section 201 of the Social Security Act.

As Mr. Greenspan said, take Social Security outside the unified budget, do not have any unified budget and growth deficit, just have the national debt and the national deficit, one accounting, not two sets of books. That is what we called for. We wrote it into law under President Bush in November 1990. It is constantly disobeyed and is being disobeyed with the two budget proposals of the President and the Republicans now.

President Clinton's budget came to us. And I call it a fraud because everyone else has called it a fraud. What it did was say we are going to hedge a way against this so-called tax cut move on the Republican side politically, so we are going to save Social Security, we are going to take care of Medicare, and pay down the debt. They mean public debt. They know they can easily do that with the Social Security money.